

## REMARKS

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

According to the foregoing, claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

### REASONS FOR ENTRY

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because the amendments of claims 1 and 2 are merely to further improve form or to provide correct antecedent basis, and do not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

### REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 5-6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY GAI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,167,445) IN VIEW OF PRAGER (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,838,918)

The rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-6 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

On page 3 of the Action, the Examiner states that Gai et al. fails to disclose more than one administrator being able to perform separate functions and, thus, in the Response to Arguments on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Prager discloses the roles of a central administrator who is responsible for a central configuration database and template models while the local administrator works with templates to create particular records and attributes for a subset of subscribing systems.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Prager. Prager relates to a method executed by a computer to increase the ease and efficiency of the configuration management task in large, complex networks of heterogeneous computer systems. (Prager, Abstract). Specifically, in Prager object-oriented programming technology is used to define a class of template objects. The template objects provide the interface through which a system administrator maintains configuration databases and establishes a consistent and coherent set of configuration management policies or operating guidelines. (Prager, col. 5, lines 8-19).

However, Applicants contend that this cited portion of Prager does not teach a system for making templates to implement policies in a system, as argued by the Examiner. (See Office Action, pages 3). Instead, Prager teaches a system using templates to establish policies in a system.

Furthermore, Applicants note in Prager that high level of authority is needed to push, or propagate, information from the stand-alone template 905 which is essentially capable of causing changes to all of the subscribing entities to that template and therefore needs a higher level of authority. (Prager, col. 11, lines 32-42). Furthermore, Fig. 4 of Prager illustrates that a system administrator 305 is able to edit the central configuration database 400, which seems to be organized into a set of templates 500, 505, and 510, as shown in Fig. 5. (Prager, col. 6, lines 40-56).

However, Applicants contend that this cited portion of Prager does not teach a setting template entry/edit unit operated by a first administrator to enter or edit a setting template, as argued by the Examiner. (See Office Action, pages 3 and 5). Therefore, Applicants contend that Prager teaches that a system administrator may only cause changes to all subscribing entities of that template.

Prager also discusses that lower level of authority is needed to perform a pull of information which is guaranteed to only update the particular template end-point 710 from which the pull was initiated. (Prager, col. 11, lines 32-42). However, Applicants contend that this cited portion of Prager does not teach an application rule entry/edit unit operated by a second administrator to enter or edit application rules prescribing rules corresponding to the setting template, which was entered or edited by the first administrator, as argued by the Examiner. (See Office Action, pages 3 and 5). Therefore, Applicants contend that Prager teaches a local administrator may only update a particular template to which he/she has access.

Even though Prager discusses the use of a lower level and higher level of administrator, Prager is silent as to the teaching of a setting template entry/edit unit operated by the first administrator and the application rule entry/edit unit operated by the second administrator.

It is respectfully submitted that Prager and Gai et al. fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, described above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and inherit its patentable recitations. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 also patentably distinguish over Gai et al.

## CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 23, 2006

By: Michael P. Stanley  
Michael P. Stanley  
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7<sup>th</sup> floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501